

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are all the claims pending in the application.

The specification is objected by the Examiner.

Claim 1 and 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated JP 2000-116105 (JP ‘105).

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Korenaga et al. (US 6,037,680).

Claims 2-4 are rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korenaga in view of applicant’s admitted prior art (see discussion on pp. 1-2 and Figs. 3a-3b of specification).

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korenaga and JP 2000-308328, in view of Tsuboi et al. US 2001/0048249.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Korenaga in view of Hwang et al. (US 6,528,907).

The Applicants traverse the rejections and request reconsideration.

Specification

The Applicants respectfully amend the Specification to overcome the objections.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Rejection of claims 1 and 7 as being anticipated by JP 2000-116105 (JP ‘105).

The Examiner is believed to be incorrect in his position that JP ‘105 discloses that the width of the magnetic back yoke is approximately equal to a width of the field permanent magnet. As noted in our previous responses, in making this assertion, the Examiner continues to misconstrue the width to be the transverse length spanned by the yoke 1 and the movable section 13 comprising the permanent magnets 14/15 as seen axially from above. This is further clear

from the Examiner's annotation of the width as shown in Drawing 1 of JP '105. It is very clear that the term "width" in claim 1, construed in light of the disclosure in Fig 1(a) does not refer to the transverse length. The Applicants respectfully reiterate the above with reference to the same annotated figures used in the previous response.

The Applicants point to paragraph [0079] of the present Specification, where it is clearly noted that the width of the magnetic back yoke 39 is approximately equal to that of the field permanent magnetic field. The same paragraph continues to note that such a configuration permits the possible maximum thrust and the possible maximum acceleration/deceleration to be realized. Clearly, having the transverse length spanned by the yoke to be approximately the same as the distance between the two magnets will not aid in providing a maximum thrust or in providing the maximum acceleration/deceleration.

To further clarify the structural differences between the present invention and JP '105, the Applicants recite that the permanent magnet is positioned only on one side of the magnetic yoke. Such a recitation will clearly distinguish from JP '105, where there are two permanent magnets that are positioned on either side of the yoke.

Claim 1 is not anticipated by JP '105 at least because of the above noted differences.

Rejection of claim 1 as being anticipated by Korenaga et al. (US 6,037,680).

The amendments to claim 1 relating to the field permanent magnet being positioned only on one side of the magnetic yoke will also distinguish the claim from Korenaga, where there are at least two field permanent magnets that are positioned on both sides of the back yoke.

Therefore, Korenaga is structurally very different from the present invention. Claim 1 is also

amended to recite that the field permanent magnet is positioned only on one side of the armature winding.

As noted in the previous section, the advantageous effects of the present invention is achieved only by positioning the field permanent magnet in relation to the magnetic yoke and the armature windings as in the present invention.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. 103

Rejection of claims 2-4 as being unpatentable over Korenaga in view of applicant's admitted prior art.

Claims 2-4 are dependent on claim 1, and are patentable at least for the same reasons. Moreover, the structural difference between the present invention and Korenaga are not overcome by the applicant's admitted prior art.

Rejection of Claim 5 based on Korenaga and JP 2000-308328, in view of Tsuboi et al. US 2001/0048249.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1, and is patentable at least for the same reasons. Moreover, the structural difference between the present invention and Korenaga are not overcome by the additional suggestions of Tsuboi.

Rejection of claim 6 based on Korenaga in view of Hwang et al. (US 6,528,907).

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 1, and is patentable at least for the same reasons.

Moreover, the structural difference between the present invention and Korenaga are not overcome by the additional suggestions of Hwang.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Chidambaram.S.Iyer/

Chid S. Iyer
Registration No. 43,355

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/265550

65565

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 3, 2008